IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re application of:
     Mathur, Sanjay et al.

Examiner: Shin, Kyung H.

Application No.: 09/817,917

Group Art Unit: 2143

Filed: March 26, 2001

Docket No.: 05222.00109

Confirmation No. 8131

Atty. File No.: 33836.0.0028

For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR PROCESSING
       DATA IN A CONTENT NETWORK

RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF NON-COMPLAINT APPEAL BRIEF

Dear Sir:

In response to the Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief dated July 10, 2008,

Appellants submit: (i) replacement page 5 setting forth a corrected Section III to comply with the

requirement that the "Status of Claims" section lists the current status of the canceled claims; (ii)

replacement pages 14-20 setting forth Appellants' arguments under separate headings for each

ground of rejection; and (iii) replacement page 2 setting forth an updated Table Of Contents to

reflect the revised pagination.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: <u>August 8, 2008</u>

By:_____
     Christopher P. Moreno
     Registration No. 38,566

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601
Phone: (312) 609-7842
Fax: (312) 609-5005

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re application of:

Mathur, Sanjay et al.	Examiner: Shin, Kyung H.
Application No.: 09/817,917	Group Art Unit: 2143
Filed: March 26, 2001	Docket No.: 05222.00109
For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR PROCESSING DATA IN A CONTENT NETWORK	Attorney File No.: 33836.00.0028

APPEAL BRIEF PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 41.37

Dear Sir:

Appellants submit this brief further to the Notice of Appeal filed June 30, 2008 in the

above-identified application ("the <u>Application</u>").

1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Real Party in Interest

Accenture LLP is the real party in interest in this appeal by virtue of an executed Assignment from the named Inventor of their entire interest to Accenture LLP. The Assignment evincing such ownership interest was recorded on June 4, 2002, in the United States Patent and Trademark Office at Reel 013021, Frame 0378.

II.   Related Appeals and Interferences

To Appellants' knowledge, there are no related Appeals or Interferences filed, pending, or decided.

III.   Status of Claims

The originally filed Application contained claims 1-29, and claims 30-32 were added by amendment in Appellants' Response to a non-final Office Action, mailed on November 1, 2004. Claim 33 was added by amendment in Appellants' Request for Continued Examination, filed on September 12, 2005. Claims 1-6, 8, 15, 21-24, 26-27 and 30-33 were subsequently canceled. Claims 7, 9-14, 16, 18-20, 25, 28 were amended during prosecution of the instant application. Claims 7, 9-14, 16-20, 25, 28 and 29 are rejected. No claims have been allowed and there are no objections to the claims. A copy of appealed claims 7, 9-14, 16-20, 25, 28 and 29 are attached at Appendix A. Of the pending, appealed claims, claims 7, 9, 16, 25, 28 and 29 are independent.

5

IV.   Status of Amendments

A non-final Office Action was mailed September 24, 2007. In response, an Amendment and Response was filed by Appellants on December 21, 2007 amending claims 7 and 25 and canceling claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 15, 21, 26, 27 and 30-33. Another non-final Office Action was subsequently mailed April 4, 2008 (the "<u>Appealed Office Action</u>"). No amendments to the claims have been made subsequent to the <u>Appealed Office Action</u>, and the claims listed in Appendix A reflect the claims as they stood at the time the <u>Appealed Office Action</u> was mailed.

V.   Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The claimed subject matter generally teaches a method for collecting data from across multiple content networks. The present invention discloses a method for creating enhanced data by adding contextual information to a plurality of discrete components collected from content networks. The enhanced data may be provided to, or received by, parties external to the given content network. These third parties may give feedback regarding the enhanced data to further modify the contextual information corresponding to the enhanced data.

Claim 7 describes a method of associating contextual information with discrete components of data. Application, page 3, lines 2-6. The method comprises accessing at least one discrete component of data from at least one data source, Id. at page 3, lines 2-3; associating said at least one discrete component of data with at least one domain, Id. at page 6, lines 11-13; and adding contextual information to said at least one discrete component of data to provide enhanced data. Id. at page 6, lines 1-4. The contextual information is associated with the at least one domain and comprises attributes of the at least one discrete component of data relating to an intended use of the at least one discrete component of data. Id. at page 3, lines 14-17. Furthermore, the method also comprises receiving feedback data from a user of the enhanced data; and modifying the enhanced data to include the feedback data. Id. at page 27, lines 4-10.

Claim 9 describes a method of delivering enhanced data through at least one digital identity. Id. at pages 7-8, lines 18-4. The method comprises receiving a request through at least one digital identity for enhanced data corresponding to an entity from a requestor, where the enhanced data may include contextual information added to at least one discrete component of data. Id. at page 8, lines 7-17. The method further comprises using a digital identity acting as a proxy for the entity to compare an identification of the requestor to access rights, Id. at page 7,

lines 19-20; transmitting from the digital identity to an enhanced content source an approval to release enhanced data, Id. at page 8, lines 1-6; and transmitting enhanced data from the enhanced content source to the requestor. Id. at page 11, lines 11-16.

Claims 10-14 are dependent claims. Claim 10 describes the method of claim 9, further comprising comparing at the digital identity an intended use of the enhanced data to usage rules. Id. at page 15, lines 12-20. Claim 11 describes the method of claim 9, wherein the digital identity is operated by a party other than the entity. Id. at page 19, lines 17-18. Claim 12 describes the method of claim 9, wherein the digital identity is operated by the entity. Id. at page 8, lines 7-17. Claim 13 describes the method of claim 9, wherein the enhanced content source is operated by a party other than the entity. Id. at page 7, lines 19-20. Claim 14 describes the method of claim 9, further including transmitting feedback rules from the enhanced content source to the requestor. Id. at page 21, lines 13-14.

Claim 16 discloses a method of obtaining information about services that may be of interest to a user. Id. at page 9, lines 1-5; page 10, lines 1-3. The method comprises discovering at least one service offered by at least one entity connected to at least one computer network, Id. at page 9, lines 1-5; receiving content from said at least one entity that includes terms of said at least one service, Id. at page 9, lines 5-7; and filtering the content to determine whether the content satisfies at least one predetermined rule. Id. at page 10, lines 5-9. Furthermore, the method comprises generating at least one decision parameter based on profile and preference information; and determining whether the terms of said at least one service are acceptable based on at least one decision parameter. Id. at page 10, lines 10-15.

Claims 17-20 are dependent claims. Claim 17 discloses the method of claim 16, wherein the discovering step is performed dynamically. Id. at page 9, lines 1-3. Claim 18 describes the

8

method of claim 16, further including negotiating with the at least one entity. Id. at page 10, lines 16-17. Claim 19 discloses the method of claim 16, further including providing financial data to the at least one entity to complete a transaction. Id. at page 8, lines 11-12. Finally, claim 20 discloses the method of claim 16, further including monitoring a transaction involving the at least one service, Id. at page 11, lines 11-13; and modifying the profile and preference information as a result of the monitoring step. Id. at page 12, lines 1-6.

Claim 25 discloses a computer-readable medium having stored thereon a data structure comprising at least one discrete component of data from at least one data source. Id. at page 25, lines 8-11. Furthermore, the data structure comprises first contextual information comprising attributes of the at least one discrete component relating to an intended use of the at least one discrete component of data, wherein the first contextual information is associated with a first domain. Id. at page 25, lines 12-20. The data structure also comprises second contextual information, comprising attributes of the at least one discrete component relating to another intended use of the at least one discrete component of data, wherein the second contextual information is associated with a second domain different from the first domain. Id. at page 26, lines 25-28. Finally, the data structure comprises a data field defining feedback rules. Id. at page 21, lines 12-14.

Claim 28 discloses a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for receiving a request through at least one digital identity for enhanced data corresponding to an entity from a requestor, the enhanced data comprising contextual information added to at least one discrete component of data. Id. at page 3, lines 1-6; page 25, lines 8-11. Also, the computer-executable instructions are operable for using a digital identity acting as a proxy for the entity to compare an identification of the requestor to access rights. Id.

at page 19, lines 17-18. Furthermore, the computer-executable instructions are operable for transmitting from the digital identity to an enhanced content source an approval to release enhanced data, Id. at page 8, lines 1-4; and transmitting enhanced data from the enhanced content source to the requestor. Id. at page 12, lines 1-4.

Claim 29 teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps comprising discovering at least one service offered by at least one entity connected to at least one computer network. Id. at page 9, lines 1-3. Additionally, the computer-executable instructions are operable for receiving content from said at least one entity that includes terms of said at least one service, and filtering the content to determine whether the content satisfies at least one predetermined rule. Id. at page 10, lines 1-3. Furthermore, the computer-executable instructions are operable for generating at least one decision parameter based on profile and preference information, and determining whether the terms of said at least one service are acceptable based on at least one decision parameter. Id. at page 10, lines 10-12.

VI.   Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

Claims 7, 9-14, 25 and 28[1] stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable

given <u>Sheth et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,311,194; hereinafter "<u>Sheth</u>") in view of <u>Slaughter et al.</u>

(U.S. Patent No. 6,970,869; hereinafter "<u>Slaughter</u>").

Claims 16-20 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable given

<u>Sheth</u> in view of <u>Slaughter</u> and in further view of <u>Rahman et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 7,042,851;

hereinafter "<u>Rahman</u>").

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject

matter.

---

[1] Appellants note that claims 8, 15, 21, 26 and 27 were previously canceled in the Amendment and Response filed by Appellant on December 21, 2007. In an apparent error, the Appealed Office Action nevertheless rejects claims 7-15, 21 and 25-28 under Section 103 on the basis of <u>Sheth</u> in view of <u>Slaughter</u>. As the cancellation of claims 8, 15, 21, 26 and 27 appears to have been acknowledged (see <u>Appealed Office Action</u>, "Detailed Action", §1), only the non-canceled claims rejected under Section 103 on the basis of <u>Sheth</u> in view of <u>Slaughter</u> are addressed in the instant Appeal Brief.

VII.   Argument

A.   Brief Summary Of The <u>Sheth</u> Reference

<u>Sheth</u> discloses a "system and method for creating a database of metadata (metabase) of a variety of digital media content . . . ." <u>Sheth</u>, Abstract, lines 1-3. "The digital media content can be semi-structured text, audio, video, animation, etc." <u>Id</u>. at col. 4, lines 63-64.

The method taught by <u>Sheth</u> "captures and enhances domain or subject specific metadata of [the] digital media content, including the specific meaning and intended use of original content." <u>Id</u>., Abstract, line 1-6. Using the metadata collected, a "graphical interface or 'skin' can be highly adapted to suit the assets of that domain." <u>Id</u>. at col. 15, lines 16-18. For example, a radio music skin might present the user with links to local Internet radio stations, or another skin could "create a 'weekly newspaper' Web page containing all the highlights for each professional sport played in a given city." <u>Id</u>. at col. 15, lines 18-23.

B.   Brief Summary Of The <u>Slaughter</u> Reference

<u>Slaughter</u> teaches "a service discovery protocol [which] may allow clients in a distributed computing environment to search for client services." <u>Slaughter</u>, Abstract, lines 1-2.

<u>Slaughter</u> teaches that, to locate a client service, the client "may send a search message in a data representational language." <u>Id</u>. at col. 8, lines 26-27. "The search message may include search criteria, such as service name and service type criteria." <u>Id</u>. at col. 8, lines 28-29. "A listener agent receiving the [search message] may compare the search criteria to service advertisements to find advertisements that match the search criteria." <u>Id</u>. at col. 8, lines 29-32.

If the client and service cannot communicate, i.e. because they use different transfer protocols, then a proxy will bridge the client to the service. <u>Id</u>. at col. 74, lines 10-16. Such a

service proxy will automatically be created. Id. at col. 74, lines 1-5. "The proxy's main job is to route messages between the client and service. . . ." Id. at col. 74, lines 5-7.

If the client is using a mobile device, then services and/or data may become available to the mobile device as it moves into a specific range within the distributed computing environment. Id. at col. 87, lines 21-24. In one embodiment of Slaughter, clients may download an application, provided by the service, to a mobile client device. Id. at col. 87, lines 46-49. "For example, moviegoers with mobile client devices may download interactive movie reviews from services in a space for the movie theater." Id. at col. 87, lines 49-51. This connection to the interactive movie review would allow clients to "perform real-time feedback about the movie they are watching." Id. at lines 49-53.

C.   Brief Summary Of The Rahman Reference

Rahman discloses a system to facilitate service creation in a network without having to access various network elements, thus minimizing network processing and network resources. Rahman, Abstract lines 9-12. Rahman teaches a "system and method employing a processing node having storage capabilities for facilitating service creation and negotiation in a wireless network." Id. at Abstract, lines 1-3. The system establishes storage capabilities in a wireless network, which contain network information and user information. Id. at col. 4, lines 38-41. In response to a request from a user to create or negotiate a service, the system accesses the storage capabilities and compares the requests with network information and user information. Id. at col. 4, lines 41-43. Based on this comparison, the system will provide the user with the appropriate network service. Id. at col. 4, lines 44-45.

13

D.   The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 Must Be Reversed Because The Claims Encompass Patentable Subject Matter

        1.   CLAIM 25

        With regards to claim 25, Appellants respectfully disagree with the rejection of claims reciting a computer-readable medium comprising a data structure on the basis that the data structure is "nonfunctional descriptive material." Contrary to this assertion, M.P.E.P. §2106.01 clearly states:

> Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material," or "nonfunctional descriptive material." In this context, "functional descriptive material" consists of data structures and computer programs which impart functionality when employed as a computer component . . . Both types of "descriptive material" are nonstatutory when claims as descriptive material (internal citations omitted). When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized.
>
> See also M.P.E.P. §2106.01(I) ("[A] claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a

data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory.")

        Claim 25 is plainly directed to a computer-readable medium comprising a data structure and thus recites nothing less than statutory functional descriptive material. For this reason, Appellants submit that the claims are suitable for allowance.

E.   The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) Based On Slaughter In View Of Sheth Must Be Reversed Because The Cited References Do Not Teach The Claimed Subject Matter As Alleged

        "If the examiner determines there is factual support for rejecting the claimed invention under 35. U.S.C. § 103, the examiner must then consider any evidence supporting the patentability of the claimed invention, such as any evidence in the specification or any other

14

evidence submitted by applicant." M.P.E.P. § 2142, page 2100-128 (8th Ed., Rev. 6, Sep. 2007) "The ultimate determination of patentability is based on the entire record, by a preponderance of evidence, with due consideration to the persuasiveness of any arguments and secondary evidence." Id. (citing In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992)). "The legal standard of "a preponderance of evidence" requires the evidence to be more convincing than the evidence which is offered in opposition to it." Id. "With regard to rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner must provide evidence which as a whole shows that the legal determination sought to be proved (i.e., the reference teachings establish a prima facie case of obviousness) is more probable than not." Id.

To reject a claim based on "combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results . . . Office personal must articulate . . . (1) a finding that the prior art included each element claimed, although not necessarily in a single prior art reference, with the only difference between the claimed invention and the prior art being the lack of actual combination of the elements in a single prior art reference . . ." See M.P.E.P. § 2143(A), page 2100-129 (8th Ed., Rev. 6, Sept. 2007).

1.   CLAIMS 7 AND 25

With regard to, for example, claim 7, the cited reference does not teach receiving feedback data and modifying the enhanced data based on the feedback data. It is alleged that the combination of Sheth in view of Slaughter teaches the receipt of feedback data from a user of the enhanced data, and the modification of the enhanced data to include the feedback data. The Appealed Office Action cites Slaughter col. 87, lines 49-53, however, the cited reference does not teach the modification of enhanced data based on the feedback data.

15

In claim 7, the enhanced data is modified based upon the feedback received. Conversely, Slaughter is silent with regard to the inclusion of such feedback data. Slaughter teaches that moviegoers using a mobile device may "perform real-time feedback about the movie they are watching." Slaughter, col. 87, lines 52-53. However, unlike claim 7, Slaughter does not teach modifying the enhanced data to include the feedback data because the feedback data, i.e. how much a moviegoer likes a movie does not affect the enhanced data, i.e. the movie. The feedback taught by Slaughter does not modify the enhanced content; if it did, then the movie itself, rather than the reviews, would have to be modified based on feedback submitted by users.

Given this shortcoming, Appellants respectfully submit that the combination of Sheth in view of Slaughter fails to establish a prima facie basis for rejecting the claims.

2.   CLAIMS 9-12 AND 28

With regard to, for example, claim 9, Appellants respectfully submit that Slaughter fails to teach a digital identity (proxy) acting on behalf of the entity, and thus a person of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Slaughter for providing a proxy on behalf of the entity. The Appealed Office Action cites two references, neither of which disclose these limitations of claim 9.

First, the reference to Slaughter, col. 27, lines 20-21 does indeed refer to a "proxy servlet (agent) 402." However, the reference is distinguished from the teachings of claim 9 because the reference clearly indicates that the "proxy" is acting for the benefit of the *requesting entity*, rather than for the enhanced content source. As stated in Slaughter: "[A] client may be a conventional browser 400 that does not support gates to participate directly in the messaging scheme described above. *The browser 400 may be aided* by a proxy servlet (agent) 402 . . . The servlet agent may translate webpage actions into messages *on behalf of the browser client*." Id. at col. 27, lines 17-30 (emphasis added).

16

Second, the <u>Appealed Office Action</u> cites col. 73, lines 30-35 of <u>Slaughter</u> as teaching a proxy acting on behalf of the entity. Despite claiming that Appellants' arguments filed on December 12, 2007 are moot in view of new grounds of rejection, Appellants respectfully submit that the second reference to <u>Slaughter</u> is simply a different portion of the same teaching as previously cited. <u>Appealed Office Action</u>, page 2. Indeed, Appellants note that the cite to <u>Slaughter</u>, col. 73 lines 30-35 describes the same techniques noted at <u>Slaughter</u>, col. 74, lines 1-21, i.e. a browser proxy. The cited portion makes clear that the proxy's purpose is to simply act as a "bridging mechanism" which may be used to "enable access of a Jini Service by a distributed computing environment client." <u>Id</u>. at col. 73, line 23-30. However, the cited portion once again fails to disclose a proxy acting on behalf of an entity, i.e., the party whose information is being requested, and for this reason Appellants respectfully submit that the cited combination of <u>Sheth</u> in view of <u>Slaughter</u> fails to teach the claimed digital identity acting as a proxy for the entity. As a result, the combination of <u>Sheth</u> in view of <u>Slaughter</u> fails to establish a prima facie case for obviousness.

    <u>3.</u>   <u>CLAIM 13</u>

        With regard to claim 13, Appellants additionally note that claim 13 is a dependent claim. Thus, the arguments separately presented herein with respect to those claims from which claim 13 depends apply equally hereto and are incorporated by this reference. Additionally, claim 13 is suitable for allowance because the cited references fail to teach an enhanced content source which is operated by a party other than the entity.

The <u>Appealed Office Action</u> cites two portions of <u>Slaughter</u> as teaching an enhanced content source which is operated by a party other than the entity. The first reference cites <u>Slaughter</u>, col. 38, lines 12-14; 48-52 and 63-64 as teaching transactions between multiple parties. The cited portion teaches how to manage data in the event that a transaction fails or

17

- CORRECTED PAGE -

succeeds. Appellants are at a loss as to the relevance of this portion to the limitations of claim 13. Simply stated, the cited portions appear wholly unrelated to the noted limitation.

The second reference cites <u>Slaughter</u>, col. 73, lines 30-35 as teaching a "proxy, acting on behalf of a service entity." <u>Appealed Office Action</u>, page 9. However, the cited portion discloses the "accessing of a Jini service proxy from *clients…*" <u>Id</u>. at col. 73, lines 33-34 (emphasis added). As discussed above with regard to, for example, claim 9, Appellants respectfully reiterate that this portion of <u>Slaughter</u> does not teach a proxy acting *on behalf of a service entity*. For these additional reasons, Appellants submit that claim 13 is suitable for allowance.

4.   CLAIM 14

With regard to claim 14, Appellants additionally note that claim 14 is a dependent claim. Thus, the arguments separately presented herein with respect to those claims from which claim 14 depends apply equally hereto and are incorporated by this reference.

Furthermore, as described above with regard to claim 7, the cited reference does not teach feedback rules because the feedback is not processed to modify the enhanced content in any way. Moreover, the cited references to <u>Slaughter</u>, col. 12, lines 2-5; col. 50, lines 63-66; and col. 57, lines 46-51, appear to describe a messaging layer, and Appellants are at a loss regarding the references' relevance to the issues of feedback. As such, Appellants respectfully submit that the combination of <u>Sheth</u> in view of <u>Slaughter</u> fails to establish prima facie obviousness of claim 14.

F.   The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) Based On Slaughter In View Of Sheth And In Further View Of Rahman Must Be Reversed Because The Cited References Do Not Teach The Claimed Subject Matter As Alleged

1.   CLAIMS 16, 17, 19, 20 AND 29

With regard to, for example, claim 16, it is asserted that <u>Slaughter</u>, col. 8, lines 37-39 teaches the determination of whether terms of at least one service are acceptable based on at least

18

one decision parameter. Appellants respectfully dispute the assertion that <u>Slaughter</u> teaches a determination of the acceptability of service terms. In particular, the cited portion of <u>Slaughter</u> discloses that once a client has discovered a service, the client can request a "capability credential" that will allow the client to access at least some of the service's capabilities. However, the cited portion does not teach the acceptability of service terms because the cited portion discloses a client that has already discovered a service, rather than a client who is looking to subscribe to the service depending on the acceptability of terms.

Furthermore, the reference to <u>Rahman</u>, col. 4, lines 43-51 does not teach a decision parameter determining whether the terms of said service are acceptable. Instead, the portion of <u>Rahman</u> simply performs a comparison between network information and user information, whereas claim 16 recites a decision parameter that is generated in response to a user's preferences. As such, Appellants respectfully submit that the combination of <u>Sheth</u> and <u>Slaughter</u> in further view of <u>Rahman</u> fails to establish prima facie obviousness of the claims.

2.   CLAIM 18

With regard to claim 18, Appellants additionally note that claim 18 is a dependent claim. Thus, the arguments separately presented herein with respect to those claims from which claim 18 depends apply equally hereto and are incorporated by this reference.

Furthermore, the cited portion of <u>Rahman</u>, col. 10, lines 53-56 teaches modifying an existing service, rather than negotiating terms of service as recited in claim 18. The cited portion teaches the determination "whether the user's desired modification to his service can be negotiated between the service and the network." <u>Rahman</u>, col. 10, lines 53-56. The portion does not teach negotiating to establish a service in the sense that claim 18 does. In particular, <u>Rahman</u>, col. 1, lines 18-20, teaches "negotiation" as "the processing performed when the user modified a currently subscribed to service." For this reason, Appellants respectfully submit that

19

the cited portion of <u>Rahman</u> fails to teach the limitations of claim 18 and therefore fails to establish a prima facie case for obviousness.

VIII. Conclusion

For the reasons advanced above, Appellants submit that the Examiner erred in rejecting pending claims 7, 9-14, 16-20, 25, 28 and 29 and respectfully request reversal of the decision of the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 30, 2008

By: /Christopher P. Moreno/
      Christopher P. Moreno
      Registration No. 38,566

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601
PHONE: (312) 609-7842
FAX: (312) 609-5005

APPENDIX A

CLAIMS ON APPEAL

7.   A method of associating contextual information with discrete components of data, the method comprising:

accessing at least one discrete component of data from at least one data source;

associating said at least one discrete component of data with at least one domain;

adding contextual information to said at least one discrete component of data to provide enhanced data, the contextual information being associated with the at least one domain and comprising attributes of the at least one discrete component of data relating to an intended use of the at least one discrete component of data;

receiving feedback data from a user of the enhanced data; and

modifying the enhanced data to include the feedback data.

9.   A method of delivering enhanced data through at least one digital identity comprising:

receiving a request through at least one digital identity for enhanced data corresponding to an entity from a requestor, the enhanced data including contextual information added to at least one discrete component of data;

using a digital identity acting as a proxy for the entity to compare an identification of the requestor to access rights;

transmitting from the digital identity to an enhanced content source an approval to release enhanced data; and

transmitting enhanced data from the enhanced content source to the requestor.

10.   The method of claim 9, further including:

comparing at the digital identity an intended use of the enhanced data to usage rules.

11.   The method of claim 9, wherein the digital identity is operated by a party other than the entity.

12.   The method of claim 9, wherein the digital identity is operated by the entity.

13.   The method of claim 9, wherein the enhanced content source is operated by a party other than the entity.

14.   The method of claim 9, further including:

transmitting feedback rules from the enhanced content source to the requestor.

16.   A method of obtaining information about services that may be of interest to a user, the method comprising:

discovering at least one service offered by at least one entity connected to at least one computer network;

receiving content from said at least one entity that includes terms of said at least one service;

filtering the content to determine whether the content satisfies at least one predetermined rule;

APPENDIX A

generating at least one decision parameter based on profile and preference information; and

determining whether the terms of said at least one service are acceptable based on at least one decision parameter.

17.   The method of claim 16, wherein the discovering step is performed dynamically.

18.   The method of claim 16, further including:

negotiating with the at least one entity.

19.   The method of claim 16, further including:

providing financial data to the at least one entity to complete a transaction.

20.   The method of claim 16, further including:

monitoring a transaction involving the at least one service; and

modifying the profile and preference information as a result of the monitoring step.

25.   A computer-readable medium having stored thereon a data structure comprising:

at least one discrete component of data from at least one data source;

first contextual information comprising attributes of the at least one discrete component relating to an intended use of the at least one discrete component of data, wherein the first contextual information is associated with a first domain;

APPENDIX A

second contextual information comprising attributes of the at least one discrete component relating to another intended use of the at least one discrete component of data, wherein the second contextual information is associated with a second domain different from the first domain; and

a data field defining feedback rules.

28.   A computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps comprising:

receiving a request through at least one digital identity for enhanced data corresponding to an entity from a requestor, the enhanced data including contextual information added to at least one discrete component of data;

using a digital identity acting as a proxy for the entity to compare an identification of the requestor to access rights;

transmitting from the digital identity to an enhanced content source an approval to release enhanced data; and

transmitting enhanced data from the enhanced content source to the requestor.

29.   A computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps comprising:

discovering at least one service offered by at least one entity connected to at least one computer network;

receiving content from said at least one entity that includes terms of said at least one service;

APPENDIX A

filtering the content to determine whether the content satisfies at least one predetermined rule

generating at least one decision parameter based on profile and preference information; and

determining whether the terms of said at least one service are acceptable based on at least one decision parameter.

<u>EVIDENCE APPENDIX</u>

[NONE]

RELATED PROCEEDINGS

[NONE]